

REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Advisory Action mailed August 20, 2003. Claims 1 – 34 and 36 – 57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanathan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,047,332, hereinafter “Viswanathan”) in view of Pallmann (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,684). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

It is well known that computers connected to the Internet utilize a plethora of different operating systems and that communication over the Internet is performed largely independently of any particular operating system or file system. The Examiner states that, “For this very reason, it would have been obvious to extend the system taught by Viswanathan to the Internet, so that file and device access would not be confined to a single operating system, but could be utilized worldwide, regardless of operating system.”

However, as Applicant previously noted in arguments filed August 7, 2003, the device access taught in Viswanathan can only be performed by computers that are a part of a cluster 201 and have access to a global file system 206 and execute a modified operating system kernel 242 taught in Viswanathan. Thus, the many computers connected to the Internet that either are not a part of the cluster 201, do not have access to the global file system 206, and/or do not execute the modified operating system kernel 242 cannot perform the device access taught in Viswanathan. Viswanathan’s system is a fundamentally platform-specific system and simply cannot be extended in the platform-independent manner proposed by the Examiner.

The Examiner also argues that it would have been obvious for the logical names taught by Viswanathan to comprise Internet URLs as taught by Pallmann so that users can access the devices taught by Viswanathan from anywhere in the world. Reference is given to Pallmann, Col 9, lines 8 – 10, wherein “the AlphaCONNECT machine 102 enables users to obtain data from and deliver data to computers in locations across the Earth through the Internet.” However, as Applicant previously noted in arguments filed August 7, 2003, Viswanathan’s system requires a global file system 206. To extend Viswanathan’s system to access devices from anywhere in the world would require a global file system accessible from anywhere in the world, and there simply is no such

global file system for the Internet. Thus, the Examiner is proposing to utilize Viswanathan's system in a manner that is not compatible with Viswanathan's teaching.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits the application is now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5150-32801/JCH.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- Return Receipt Postcard
- Request for Continued Examination
- Fee Authorization

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey C. Hood
Reg. No. 35,198
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: 10/27/2003